DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 669 SP 033 558

AUTHOR Amos, Neil; Cheeseman, Robert H.
TITLE An Analysis of Provisional Teachers Failing the Mississippi Assessment Instruments for Certification.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Lexington, KY, November 13-15, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Check Lists; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Lesson Observation Criteria; Preservice Teacher Education; Scoring Formulas; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instruments; *Performance Based Evaluation; Performance Indicators; Provisional Certification

ABSTRACT

The Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instruments (MTAI) for the evaluation of beginning teachers has been adopted by the Mississippi State Board of Education. The MTAI assesses on-the-job performance and consists of 16 competencies measured by 3 separate instruments, which are to be administered twice during the beginning teacher's first year of professional practice. The first instrument measures teaching plans and materials, with evaluation based on the teacher's portfolio of lesson plans. The second instrument assesses the teacher's cognitive interaction with learners, skill in organizing and presenting instruction, and classroom management, all measured by classroom observation. The third instrument evaluates classroom environment and interpersonal skills, utilizing observation as the measuring technique. A statistical report presents individual indicators that were failed by beginning teachers; analysis is also made on the basis of gender and race. A large number of provisional teachers failed to clear proficiency on the first evaluation and to a lesser degree on the second. Implications point to the need for more attention by preservice and staff development programs to effective performance on the Teaching Plans and Materials sections. The complete Mississippi Teaching Competencies and Indicators (MTCI) instrument is appended. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341669

AN ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONAL TEACHERS FAILING THE MISSISSIPPI ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION

By

Neil Amos

Mississippi State University

and

Robert H. Cheeseman

Mississippi State Department of Education

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, Kentucky, November 13-15, 1991.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Amos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033558

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONAL TEACHERS FAILING THE MISSISSIPPI ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION

Rationale

Critics of the educational system have, over the past few years, berated the quality of teaching and the profession in general. Many qualified people have become discouraged by this attitude toward teaching and have begun to look for other areas of employment. Fewer people are entering the teaching profession. Those competent teachers who remain often become so apathetic toward their job that they do not perform to their ability.

Some of the latest educational reports have suggested incentives, such as pay raises, in order to attract and keep competent, qualified teachers (A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, 1983; A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, 1986; Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986). This push for a monetary incentive has also brought up the question of merit. Because effectiveness is the major concern of the critics, there is an increasing demand for the use of performance assessment instruments to judge the appropriateness of a pay increase. Many states are now making an attempt to satisfy this concern.

The Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instruments (MTAI) were originally adopted by the State Board of Education upon recommendation of the Certification Commission to be used for the assessment of beginning teachers in Mississippi. It is an adaptation of the Georgia Teacher Assessment Instrument.

The State of Georgia developed an on-the-job performance instrument for teacher assessment through a state-funded contract in April, 1976. The University of Georgia created the Teacher Performance

Assessment Instruments (TPAI) and field tested them within that state between the fall of 1977 and the spring of 1980. During that time, two revisions were made on the Georgia instruments, but Mississippi elected to choose the 1979 version with only a few changes for the 1986 Mississippi teacher evaluation instrument.

The MTAI consists of 16 teaching competencies. These were validated as essential for both beginning and experienced teachers by a large number of practicing teachers in Mississippi during a validation study conducted by the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Mississippi (Cage, 1984).

The first 14 competencies are measured by the three separate instruments of the MTAI. The last two performance standards are assessed by the local district.

Competencies I-IV are measured by the first instrument, Teaching Plans and Materials (TPM). These competencies assess the teacher's skill in planning instruction, selecting procedures, and choosing materials to achieve and evaluate the instructional objectives. The competencies are assessed solely from the teacher's portfolio of lesson plans.

Ryans (1960) listed 25 characteristics of effective teachers. One of those was "classroom procedure is planned and well organized" (p. 82). An administrator should evaluate a teacher's plans to see if the objectives will be presented in a way to reach all students regardless of ability, style, or rate. Different instructional methods may also need to be used for different subjects (Evertson, 1979; Rosenshine, 1979). Shavelson and Stein (1981) reported that planning lessons for interactive teaching is a problem for many teachers.

Competencies V-XI are measured by the second instrument, Position Skills (PS). These competencies assess the teacher's cognitive interaction with learners, skill in organizing and presenting instruction, and skill in classroom management. The competencies are

measured by classroom observation of the teacher by certified MTAI assessors.

Interactive teaching strategies will be necessary to meet the teach-test-reteach-retest method of instruction mandated by the Education Reform Act of 1982. Research has shown that these positive interactive teaching traits can be taught to teachers (Brophy, 1982; Cohen, 1984). Questioning and response techniques and providing feedback with appropriate wait time (Rowe, 1974) also promote interaction. Flanders (1970) reported that most successful teachers utilize interaction methods of teaching.

The third instrument, Interpersonal Skills (IS), measures competencies XII-XIV. These guide the assessment of the classroom climate or environment fostered by the teacher. Interpersonal skills range from friendly and understanding (Amos, 1968) to a strong self-concept (Handley, 1987). Again, direct observation is the measuring technique used by MTAI assessors.

Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instruments (MTAI)

Teaching Plans and Materials

Purpose

The purpose of this instrument is to guide assessment of the beginning teacher's competence in planning instruction, selecting procedures, and choosing materials to achieve and evaluate the instructional objectives. Additionally, it provides information about the manner in which a teacher handles learning problems, monitors the needs and progress of learners, and determines the effectiveness of instruction.

Conditions for Use

This instrument, along with the Position Skills and the Interpersonal Skills Instruments, is to be administered twice during the beginning teacher's first year of professional practice. The first assessment is to be conducted in the fall and the second in the spring.

The fall assessment will be conducted between the sixth and twelfth weeks of school. The spring assessment will be conducted not sooner than 45 days after the fall assessment but prior to April 15. These time limits are designed to insure that assessments not be conducted during the first or last 20 working days of the school year.

Three different provisional teacher evaluations complete this instrument: an external evaluator, building principal, or another designated administrator who is responsible for supervising the provisional teacher, and a peer teacher. Either the external evaluator or the peer teacher must be certified to teach in the same level as the beginning teacher who is being assessed.

Information for rating items on this instrument is obtained from a portfolio of teaching plans and labeled examples within the portfolio. Each evaluator will need to have an opportunity to examine the teacher's portfolio and have access to the beginning teacher's classroom during a designated instructional unit of 10 days.

Prior to assessment, beginning teachers must be oriented to the sequence of events which constitutes the assessment process. At least 10 days in advance of assessment, expectations for a portfolio of plans covering a 10 day instructional unit must be clarified.

To complete the instrument, information concerning Indicators 1-12 comes exclusively from observations made of the portfolio content. Information on Indicators 6-12 comes from the TPM Questionnaire completed by the teacher and submitted with the portfolio.

The TPM was developed to guide the assessment of lesson plans, teaching methods, and instructional materials used by teachers. It enables the evaluator to examine the appropriateness of these procedures in regard to the students' ability levels, learning rates and styles, and learning problems. The final section of the instrument pertains to the procedures used by teachers to determine the effectiveness of instruction and to make revisions in instruction as needed.

Of the 16 generic competencies, four are assessed with the TPM. There four competencies are defined by 12 indicators. The indicators are objectified by descriptors which further specify the intent. For four of the indicators, each set of descriptors defines a range of teaching behaviors which characterize the corresponding indicator. The five levels of performance range from failure to demonstrate the behavior to ideal performance of the behavior. For the other eight indicators, four practices which may or may not be used by the teacher in the classroom are listed; the rating is dependent upon how many of the practices are used appropriately.

The first five indicators in this instrument can be rated almost solely on the basis of information found in the portfolio. Examples need to be listed on Indicators 6-12 to ascertain the reason why certain of the learning activities were developed.

Position Skills

Purpose

The purpose of this instrument is to guide the assessment of the beginning teacher's cognitive interaction with learners, skills in organizing and presenting instruction, and skill in classroom management.

Conditions for Use

This instrument, along with the Teaching Plans and Materials and the Interpersonal Skills Instrument, is to be administered twice during the beginning teacher's first year of professional practice. The first assessment is to be conducted in the fall, and the second in the spring. The fall assessment will be conducted between the sixth and twelfth weeks of school. The spring assessment will be conducted not sooner than 45 days after the fall assessment but prior to April 15. These time limits are designed to insure that assessments not be conducted during the first or last 20 working days of the school year.

Three different evaluators complete this instrument: an external data collector, building principal or another designated administrator who is responsible for supervising the provisional teacher, and a peer teacher. Either the external evaluator or the peer teacher must be certified to teach in the same field as the beginning teacher who is being assessed.

Prior to assessment, beginning teachers must be oriented to the sequence of events which constitutes the assessment process. The beginning teacher should understand that each evaluator will need to observe a minimum of one class period each during the specified teaching unit. Observation dates will be scheduled separately for each evaluator in advance, allowing the teacher considerable latitude in selecting specific classes and dates. This instrument should never be rated on the basis of a "drop-in" observation.

Each evaluator must conduct an independent observation of at least one class period to obtain information to complete this instrument. Responses should reflect only direct observations of the teacher at the time of the assessment. Where an instrument item has not been observed during the class period, the response to that item should be marked with an "N."

Should an evaluator need to clarify or verify classroom impressions, the teacher may be questioned privately concerning the observation. To insure fairness, assessment instruments should be completed by keeping in mind factors such as the resources available to teachers, the students that they teach, and the facilities of the school. Teachers are rated on what they do, but should not be rated low for reasons beyond their control.

Interpersonal Skills

Purpose

This instrument is designed to guide the assessment of the classroom climate or environment fostered by the beginning teacher. Its

dual focus is on teacher characteristics such as enthusiasm, warmth, and patience, as well as on the teacher's ability to manage the classroom environment.

Conditions for Use

This instrument, which is rated simultaneously with Position Skills, is to be administered twice during the beginning teacher's first year of professional practice. The first assessment is to be conducted in the fall, and the second in the spring. The fall assessment will be conducted between the sixth and twelfth weeks of school. The spring assessment will be conducted not sooner than 45 days after the fall assessment but prior to April 15. These time limits are designed to insure that assessments not be conducted during the first or last 20 working days of the school year.

Three different evaluators complete this instrument: an external data collector, building principal or another designated administrator who is responsible for supervising the provisional teacher, and a peer teacher. Either the external evaluator or the peer teacher must be certified to teach in the same field as the beginning teacher who is being assessed.

Prior to assessment, beginning teachers must be oriented to the sequence of events which constitutes the assessment process. The beginning teacher should understand that each evaluator will need to observe a minimum of one class period each during the specified teaching unit. Observation dates will be scheduled separately for each evaluator in advance, allowing the teacher considerable latitude in selecting specific classes and dates. This instrument should never be rated on the basis of a "drop-in" observation.

Each evaluator must conduct an independent observation of at least one class period to obtain information to complete this instrument, as well as the Position Skills Instrument. Responses should reflect only direct observations of the teacher at the time of the assessment. Where

an instrument item has not been observed during the class period, the response to that item should be marked with an "N."

Should an evaluator need to clarify or verify classroom impressions, the teacher may be questioned privately concerning the observation. To insure fairness, assessment instruments should be completed by keeping in mind factors such as the resources available to teachers, the students that they teach, and the facilities of the school. Teachers are rated on what they do, but should not be rated low for reasons beyond their control.

Findings

This section presents a statistical analysis on the Mississippi State Department of Education records of provisional teacher evaluations on the MTAI for the 1990-91 academic year. Basic statistical procedures were used to analyze evaluator ratings of the provisional teachers. The ratings consisted of 16 indicators scored on a single 1-5 scale and 104 "Yes/No" descriptors. These descriptors are then combined to form 26 additional indicators. The 42 indicators are then grouped into 14 competencies. These 42 indicators employed in the MTAI are then dichotomized by a "cut score." The competency score is derived from the number of indicators at or above the "cut score."

The following table presents individual indicators which teachers failed at a percentage rate of approximately 63% or above on the first evaluation total rating. Analysis is also made on the basis of gender and race.

Table 1

Statistical Report of Provisional Assessment Indicators Failed

Indicator		Trial 1		Trial 2		Trial 3		Trial 4	
6	Total	137	70.2%	52	26.6%	6	3.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	97	49.7%	38	19.4%	3	1.5%	0	0.0%
	Male	40	20.5%	14	7.1%	3	1.5%	0	0.0%
	White	103	52.8%	40	20.5%	6	3.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	32	16.4%	12	6.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Total	122	70.1%	46	26.4%	6	3.4%	0	0.0%
	Female	89	51.1%	32	18.3%	3	1.7%	0	0.0%
	Male	33	18.9%	14	8.0%	3	1.7%	0	0.0%
	White	91	52.2%	38	21.8%	6	3.4%	0	0.0%
	Black	29	16.6%	6	3.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.5%	2	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Total	102	69.8%	38	26.0%	6	4.1%	0	0.0%
	Female	75	51.3%	26	17.8%	3	2.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	27	18.4%	12	8.2%	3	2.0%	0	0.0%
	White	75	51.3%	34	23.2%	6	4.1%	0	0.0%
	Black	27	18.4%	4	2.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	Total	88	63.3%	48	34.5%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%
	Female	59	42.4%	38	27.3%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%
	Male	29	20.8%	10	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	63	45.3%	34	24.4%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%
	Black	22	15.8%	10	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.7%	2	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	Total	130	65.6%	62	31.3%	6	3.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	88	44.4%	46	23.2%	6	3.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	42	21.2%	16	8.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	94	47.4%	40	20.2%	6	3.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	35	17.6%	20	10.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.00%	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

11	Total	20	90.9%	2	9.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	15	68.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	5	22.7%	2	9.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	11	50.0%	2	9.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	9	40.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
12	Total	31	83.7%	6	16.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	21	56.7%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	10	27.0%	4	10.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	15	40.5%	6	16.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	15	40.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
13	Total	93	63.2%	54	36.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	74	50.3%	44	29.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	19	12.9%	10	6.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	77	52.3%	34	23.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	15	10.2%	16	10.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.6%	2	1.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
14	Total	29	64.4%	16	35.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	22	48.8%	10	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	7	15.5%	6	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	25	55.5%	12	26.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	4	8.8%	4	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18	Total	52	65.0%	24	30.0%	0	0.0%	4	5.0%
	Female	36	45.0%	16	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	16	20.0%	8	10.0%	0	0.0%	4	5.0%
	White	38	47.5%	16	20.0%	0	0.0%	4	5.0%
	Black	14	17.5%	8	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
22	Total	63	64.9%	34	35.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	50	51.5%	24	24.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	13	13.4%	10	10.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	47	48.4%	20	20.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	16	16.4%	12	12.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

23	Total	37	62.7%	22	37.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	30	50.8%	16	27.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	7	11.8%	6	10.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	28	47.4%	14	23.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	8	13.5%	6	10.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	1.6%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
24	Total	192	63.7%	96	31.8%	9	2.9%	4	1.3%
	Female	147	48.8%	76	25.2%	9	2.9%	0	0.0%
	Male	45	14.9%	20	6.6%	0	0.0%	4	1.3%
	White	157	52.1%	70	23.2%	9	2.9%	4	1.3%
	Black	33	10.9%	22	7.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
30	Total	23	74.1%	8	25.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	16	51.6%	6	19.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	7	22.5%	2	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	18	58.0%	4	12.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	5	16.1%	2	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	2	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
31	Total	139	69.8%	60	30.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	98	49.2%	46	23.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	41	20.6%	14	7.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	116	58.2%	36	18.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	21	10.5%	18	9.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	2	1.0%	4	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
32	Total	17	89.4%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	11	57.8%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	6	31.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	12	63.1%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	4	21.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	5.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
36	Total	13	76.4%	4	23.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	11	64.7%	2	11.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	2	11.7%	2	11.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	11	64.7%	2	11.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	2	11.7%	2	11.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

37	Total	43	84.3%	8	15.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	32	62.7%	4	7.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	11	21.5%	4	7.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	31	60.7%	6	11.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	12	23.5%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
38	Total	18	69.2%	8	30.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	15	57.6%	4	15.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	3	11.5%	4	15.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	13	50.0%	4	15.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	5	19.2%	4	15.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
39	Total	58	64.4%	32	35.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	45	50.0%	24	26.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	13	14.4%	8	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	48	53.3%	18	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	9	10.0%	14	15.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
40	Total	42	63.6%	20	30.3%	0	0.0%	4	6.0%
	Female	35	53.0%	14	21.2%	0	0.0%	4	6.0%
	Male	7	10.6%	6	9.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	37	56.0%	10	15.1%	0	0.0%	4	6.0%
	Black	4	6.0%	10	15.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
41	Total	94	69.1%	42	30.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	76	55.8%	32	23.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	18	13.2%	10	7.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	80	58.8%	28	20.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	13	9.5%	14	10.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
42	Total	49	63.6%	28	36.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Female	43	55.8%	20	25.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Male	6	7.7%	8	10.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	White	43	55.8%	16	20.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Black	5	6.4%	12	15.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Other	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

As stated above, indicators were selected for this study if the total number of teachers who failed the first trial evaluation reached approximately 63% or above. Indicator 6 results on trial 1 also are interesting when you observe the larger number of females and white teachers failing. Indicator 24 is another example of a large percentage of female and white teachers not passing. A general trend throughout is for a larger percentage of female teachers and white teachers failing to pass on the first evaluation on all the indicators presented in this study. It was also interesting to note that only on Indicators 18, 24, and 40 did teachers not clear proficiency after four evaluation trials. Special notation is made to the fact that Indicators 6-12 related to the questionnaire part of the Teaching Plans and Materials (TPM).

Implications

Teacher educators and administrators in Mississippi should pay special attention to these 22 MTAI Indicators which account for a large number of provisional teachers failing to clear proficiency on the first evaluation and to a lessor degree on the second evaluation. Certainly more attention is needed on preservice and staff development when it comes to how to perform effectively on the Teaching Plans and Materials, especially Indicators 6-12 on the questionnaire. Mentor programs for inductees into the teaching field might prove helpful for beginning and/or provisional teachers on the MTAI evaluations.

REFERENCES

Brophy, J. (1982). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Cage, B. N. (1984, February). Teacher competency survey evaluation report. Oxford: University of Mississippi.

Cohen, H. C. (1984). The effects of two teaching strategies utilizing manipulation on the development of logical thought. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21(6), 769-778.

Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1979). Beginning school. Educational Horizon, 57, 164-168.

Flanders, N. (1970). Analyzing teacher behavior. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Handley, H. (1987). Project RAFT: Research applications for teaching (module 1). Project sponsored by National Institute for Education. Mississippi State: Mississippi State University.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Rosenshine, B. V. (1979). Content time and direct instruction. In P. C. Peterson (Ed.), Research on teaching: Findings and implications. Cambridge, MA: Howard University Press.

Ryans, D. (1960). Characteristics of teachers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Shavelson, R., & Stein, P. (1981). Research on teaching pedagogical thoughts, judgements, decisions, and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 15, 455-498.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

APPENDIX

Mississippi Teaching Competencies and Indicators

MISSISSIPPI TEACHING COMPETENCIES AND INDICATORS

COMPETENCY I:	PLANS INSTRUCTION TO ACHIEVE SELECTED OBJECTIVES.
Indicator 1.	Specifies or selects learner objectives for lessons.
Indicator 2.	Specifies or selects teaching procedures for lessons.
Indicator 3.	Specifies or selects content, materials, and media for lessons.
Indicator 4.	Specifies or selects materials and procedures for assessing learner progress on the objectives.
Indicator 5.	Plans instruction at a variety of levels.
COMPETENCY II:	ORGANIZES INSTRUCTION TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AMONG LEARNERS.
Indicator 6.	Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their capabilities.
Indicator 7.	Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their learning styles.
Indicator 8.	Organizes instruction to take into account differences among learners in their rates of learning.
COMPETENCY III:	OBTAINS AND USES INFORMATION ABOUT THE NEEDS AND PROGRESS OF INDIVIDUAL LEARNERS.
Indicator 9.	Uses teacher-made or teacher-selected evaluation materials or procedures to obtain information about learner progress.
Indicator 10.	Communicates with individual learners about their needs and progress.
COMPETENCY IV:	OBTAINS AND USES INFORMATION ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INSTRUCTION TO REVISE IT WHEN NECESSARY.
Indicator 11.	Obtains information on the effectiveness of instruction.
Indicator 12.	Revises instruction as needed using evaluation results and observation data.
COMPETENCY V:	USES INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES, METHODS, AND MEDIA RELATED TO THE OBJECTIVES.
Indicator 13.	Uses teaching methods appropriate for objectives, learners and environment.
Indicator 14.	Uses instructional equipment and other instructional aids.

Indicator 15.	Uses instructional materials that provide learners with appropriate practice on objectives.
COMPETENCY VI:	COMMUNICATES WITH LEARNERS.
Indicator 16.	Gives directions and explanations related to lesson content.
Indicator 17.	Clarifies directions and explanations when learners misunderstand lesson content.
Indicator 18.	Uses responses and questions from learners in teaching.
Indicator 19.	Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.
Indicator 20.	Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners.
COMPETENCY VII:	DEMONSTRATES A REPERTOIRE OF TEACHING METHODS.
Indicator 21.	Implements learning activities in a logical sequence.
Indicator 22.	Demonstrates ability to conduct lessons using a variety of teaching methods.
Indicator 23.	Demonstrates ability to work with individuals, small groups, and large groups.
COMPETENCY VIII:	REINFORCES AND ENCOURAGES LEARNER INVOLVEMENT IN INSTRUCTION.
Indicator 24.	Uses procedures which get learners initially involved in lessons.
Indicator 25.	Provides learners with opportunities for participating.
Indicator 26.	Maintains learner involvement in lessons.
Indicator 27.	Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement.
COMPETENCY IX:	DEMONSTRATES AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCHOOL SUBJECT BEING TAUGHT AND DEMONSTRATES ITS RELEVANCE.
Indicator 28.	Helps learners recognize the purpose and importance of topics or activities.
Indicator 29.	Demonstrates knowledge in the subject area.
COMPETENCY X:	ORGANIZES TIME, SPACE, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT FOR INSTRUCTION.
Indicator 30.	Attends to routine tasks.
Indicator 31.	Uses instructional time effectively.

Indicator 32. Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly.

COMPETENCY XI: DEMONSTRATES HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR LEARNERS' ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE.

Indicator 35. Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.

Indicator 28. Helps learners recognize the purpose and importance of topics or activities.

Indicator 27. Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement.

Indicator 29. Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.

Indicator 31. Uses instructional time efficiently.

COMPETENCY XII: DEMONSTRATES ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING AND THE SUBJECT BEING TAUGHT.

Indicator 33. Communicates personal enthusiasm.

Indicator 34. Stimulates learner interest.

Indicator 35. Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.

COMPETENCY XIII: HELPS LEARNERS DEVELOP POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPTS.

Indicator 36. Demonstrates warmth and friendliness.

Indicator 37. Demonstrates sensitivity to the needs and feelings of learners.

Indicator 38. Demonstrates patience, empathy, and understanding.

COMPETENCY XIV: MANAGES CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS.

Indicator 39. Provides feedback to learners about their behavior.

Indicator 40. Promotes comfortable interpersonal relationships.

Indicator 41. Maintains appropriate classroom behavior.

Indicator 42. Manages disruptive behavior among learners.